

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop Meeting held August 13, 2013

A workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6:02 p.m. by Chairman William B. Hawk, on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Supervisors present in addition to Mr. Hawk were: William C. Seeds, Sr., William L. Hornung, and David B. Blain.

Also in attendance was George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steven Stine, Township Solicitor; Christine Arnold, Nobody's Cats Foundation; Mark DiSanto and John DiSanto, Triple Crown Corporation; R.J. Fisher, R. J. Fisher & Associates, Inc.; Jeff Staub, Dauphin Engineering Co.; Benjamin Slotznick; Sam Robbins, Public Works Director; Stephen Fleming, HRG, Inc.,; and Eric Epstein, Watson Fisher and Ted Robertson, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Seeds led in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public Comment

Mr. Eric Epstein, SWAN, wanted to inform the Board that his home insurance rates increased by at least 25% to 35%. He noted that the insurance commission has approved rate increases for property home insurance rates due to weather events. He noted that it was a substantial increase and he was blindsided by this. He questioned if there was anything that could be done by this. Mr. Crissman noted that he was told by his insurance company to budget 10% higher due to the past events from Hurricane Sandy and Tropical Storm Lee. Mr. Epstein stated that he did not understand why this region should take a hit when it was not necessarily hit by those storms. Mr. Seeds stated that we are all paying for it. Mr. Crissman noted that it is true for Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and he was told that it is nation-wide. Mr. Epstein suggested that his information should be passed on to people in order to prepare those who are on fixed incomes.

Mr. Ken Parmer, 4292 South Carolina Drive, explained that he spoke during public comment at the last Board meeting to express concern with a stormwater basin in the Estates of

Autumn Oaks, and he received a letter from Mr. Wolfe. He noted that he responded to that letter over a week ago and has not received a response from his second letter. Mr. Wolfe explained that the response to the letter was mailed this date. He explained that the Board was copied on all the correspondence in regards to this matter. Mr. Parmer questioned about the minimum depth of 18 inches for the basin. Mr. Wolfe answered that the answer to his question could be found in the response that he provided to him in the letter that he mailed this date. Mr. Parmer questioned Mr. Wolfe if he was going to respond to his question. Mr. Wolfe noted that the item is not on the agenda for this meeting. Mr. Parmer noted that it is a public comment session. He noted that he has a copy of page six and seven of the CMX report that the developer was to follow and they did not follow it. He noted the reason he brought this information to the Board was because he spoke to Mr. Fleming and everyone stated that the site was fine, and Mr. Wolfe sent him a copy of the CMX Report. He noted that he is looking for the 18 inches of minimum depth for the low permeable liner, and can't find it. He stated that the information was on page seven of his report and he found that page seven was missing from the report that Mr. Wolfe sent him. He noted that HRG and Advanced Engineering were working with that copy of the report and they did not have a copy of page seven. He included page six as well because they state if the developer can't make the basin using the clay they must use a manmade liner. He stated that he knows that it is less than 18 inches and only six inches. He suggested the way to stop this and to get the attention of the developer is to place a stop order for construction to stop proceeding with the development until the basin is fixed. He noted that the developer will continue to build and when it is done, they will walk and that will be it. He noted that he will wait for Mr. Wolfe's response and be back next week. Mr. Hawk noted for any board member to try to respond knowledgeably would be difficult. Mr. Parmer questioned Mr. Hawk if he got a copy of Mr. Wolfe's letter. Mr. Wolfe responded to Mr. Parmer that the Board gets copies of everything that he mailed to him and he also provides them with his response.

Mr. Seeds questioned who this letter is from. Mr. Parmer answered that it is the CMX Report from 2008. He noted in 2008, the residents spent \$2,000 to have a consultant state that there could be a problem with the retention ponds that were uphill of the residents. He noted that Mr. McNaughton had CMX do a report. He noted that another company is monitoring the project and they stated that the soil is okay but there is no confirmation for the depth of the soil.

Cathy Gaiski, Devonshire Heights Road, questioned if there was a way to get a traffic light or four way stop sign at Devonshire Heights and Nyes Roads. Mr. Blain answered that the intersection has been designed for a roundabout and it is being funded by the State. He noted that the engineers have completed the design and there will be some type of traffic circle. He explained that right of ways will have to be acquired from resident's property so it may take some time to complete, but the project is in process.

Presentation by Lower Paxton Township Community Cats

Ms. Christine Arnold, President of The Nobody's Cats Foundation, explained that it is a non-profit that was founded in early 2012 to focus solely on Trap Neuter Return Program (TNR). She noted that the purpose is to aid people in TNR to achieve the goal of fewer cats for everyone. She explained that she was asked by Stacy Romberger, Lower Paxton (LP) Community Cats to talk about ways that her program can improve to become more efficient to generate better numbers. She noted that she emailed materials for the Board to review and noted that she will briefly go through the information.

Ms. Arnold reported that she is trying to balance what TNR is and what it is not. She noted that she wanted to explain what LP Community Cats can or cannot do. She noted that the goal of TNR is to focus solely on humanly managing and reducing the population of free roaming domestic cats primarily by cutting reproduction. She noted that these animals reproduce like rabbits, can get pregnant at five months of age, and 64 days later they have a litter and kittens who are born early in the year that are old enough to have kittens of their own at the end of the year, even though 60% to 75% of these cats die before they are a year old. She noted that they will replace themselves so many times over that the incredible high mortality rate is insignificant in terms of how the populations expand. She noted that is why we are in a fix for this region as the organization focuses on eight counties in South Central Pennsylvania, and she estimates that there are 300,000 to 400,000 free roaming cats. She noted that only 3% of the feral cats are altered, and 85% of pet cats are altered.

Ms. Arnold noted that the colonies were originally derived from spayed and unneutered pets but it has now gone beyond that. She noted that TNR is a comprehensive strategy, not just running out and picking up cats and altering them and dumping them back out into society. She noted that it involves caregivers who provide ongoing feeding and sheltering, monitoring, noting

if you altered 15 animals given the number of animals that are out there, another one will come through if you don't get that one done quickly.

Ms. Arnold noted that she sees caregivers and Community Cats programs as the Board's strongest allies for making a difference in the community to reduce the colonies and the associated expenses that go with managing them, such as police enforcement, codes enforcement, and animal control costs. She noted that the Borough of Steelton's program has been very successful, with an estimated savings of \$18,000 a year in animal control, codes and police enforcement costs. She noted in the past two and a half years since their program started they have been able to save enough money to hire two new police officers by humanely reducing and managing the population of cats in Steelton which was one of the historic dumping grounds for pets. She noted that they had a borough sponsored location so it was easy to get a lot of pets done in a condensed period of time.

Ms. Arnold noted that TNR is not an adoption program to move animals out in large numbers into homes, given the number of cats out there, and the fact that fewer than 24% of pet cats in people homes come from shelters and rescues. She noted that a friend or neighbor shares with you that a litter of kittens has been born under their deck; you are more likely to take cats from them then to go to a shelter or rescue. She noted that studies have shown that 70% of cats in people's homes came from outdoor colonies. She noted that it is very difficult for shelters and rescues to move cats and very hard for a TNR program to do it as well. She noted that you have to foster animals in a home, get them into an adoption center, pay for all the expenses to place them, and it distracts people from the focus of TNR which is to prevent the animals from being born in the first place. She noted that it is not an adoption or relocation program and there is no where for these cats to go except for where they are. She noted that the purpose is to prevent them from reproducing and expanding and the LP Community Cats program is doing that. She noted that they have spay/neutered 741 cats in two years preventing a minimum of 9,000 cats from being born. She noted that her goal is to help LP Community Cats become more focused, noting that TNR works best if you target areas.

Ms. Arnold noted that the PetSmart Grant Program for LP Community Cats is targeted for Police Zones 1 and 3 which is the western half of the Township from the northern to the southern boundaries. She noted to fulfill the grant requirements over the next year LP

Community Cats must focus on these zones to show significant results in that area in order to attract additional PetSmart Grants. She noted that although the focus is for Zones 1 and 3, it does not mean that we can't do more things to get more people involved in TNR elsewhere, and that is where The Nobody's Cats Foundation can help. She noted that it can provide training, noting that a high volume TNR clinic opened last week and when it is fully running; they will be doing 60 to 65 surgeries a day, five days a week. She noted that her clinic will provide 12,000 to 13,000 surgeries a year. She explained that she wants to encourage the community to use the service, to use PAWS, and any of the many services that are out there so that more cats can be spayed/neutered to have fewer cats to deal with.

Ms. Arnold noted that she is offering free seminars in the Township on a monthly basis starting this month and everyone is welcome. She noted that the classes are free and it is a very basic and practical training, meant to teach people how to implement the strategies so they can go home to care for the cats in their backyard and if they all focus on the cat in their own backyard and neighborhood, we can get all these animals taken care of and the Township can enjoy the financial benefits of not having to deal with them.

Ms. Arnold noted that the clinic will provide surgeries for \$25 per pet, regardless of gender and every cat will get a rabies vaccine, distemper vaccine, parasite treatment, post op antibiotic, and ear tip to identify the cat as being an altered cat so people don't waste time trapping it again.

Ms. Arnold noted that it would be helpful if the Township would become more of an advocate for the program so when people call in into the Township, staff will have a script to provide the necessary information for the general public and answer their general questions. She noted that she will provide free materials and information to distribute to the public that are professionally produced. She explained that she loans traps and is able to provide shelters and feeding stations to help manage the colonies.

Ms. Arnold noted that she hopes to focus the program in the coming year to attract more PetSmart Grant Funds to the necessary zones in order to get good results and future funding. She noted that the responsibility must be spread to the community instead of resting it all on a handful of a few people to offer the tools that are necessary to have a successful program.

Mr. Hawk questioned if Ms. Arnold was looking for funding. Ms. Arnold answered no, noting that the program is funded for the next year. She noted that she is looking to provide phone scripts for the staff that answers the phone at the Municipal Center to provide the proper information for the TNR program.

Mr. Hawk questioned if Ms. Arnold is aware of Castaway Critters. Ms. Arnold noted that it is a local rescue and spay neuter program. Mr. Hawk noted that they try to adopt their rescued cats. Ms. Arnold noted that all local rescues do that and are turning animals away as they don't have the resources to do this due to the number of animals that are out there since they adopt a very small number of animals every year. She noted that is the big challenge that the rescues are facing, that the population has expanded to such a degree that people don't need to go to shelters and rescues to get a pet. Mr. Hawk noted that not everyone is a pet lover. Ms. Arnold noted that it does not matter if you like cats or not, we all share the same goal, having fewer cats.

Ms. Arnold noted that the clinic is open to anyone, all they have to do is trap the cat, drop it off in the morning, pay the \$25, pick up the cat in the afternoon, and release it when they get it home after providing some time to recovery from the surgery. She noted that they don't care where the cats come from, noting that they have arrangements with Cast Away Cats, SNAP, and other organizations that have grant funding to reimburse us with their grant funding. She noted that she will be working with Ms. Romberger and her LP Community Cats program to partner with her for what she can do. She explained if the program does not become more effective it will lose access to the PetSmart funding. She noted that we need to focus on zones 1 and 3 and spread out the responsibility to implement the program into the community to get more people involved. She noted once zones 1 and 3 are taken care of, then it can move on to the other zones.

Ms. Romberger noted that all the calls coming into the Township in regards to cats have been referred to her organization. She noted that she needs to focus on the TNR in addition to trying to get some kittens adopted but it can't be her focus as it must be strictly TNR in zones 1 and 3. Ms. Arnold explained that we need to raise awareness in the public that there is no place for the cats to go and it is best to trap the cats.

Mr. Seeds questioned what else the Board can do to help. Ms. Arnold answered that you have an existing program that is very effective when it is focused. She noted that it is very

important that when someone calls the Township staff provides the correct information. She noted that she will provide the script for staff to use for phone calls.

Mr. Crissman questioned Ms. Arnold if she had a brochure that could be put on the table in the Municipal Center lobby. Ms. Arnold answered that she will provide the Township with the necessary information from the Alley Cat Allies. Ms. Romberger requested that the information be put in the Township newsletter. Mr. Hawk noted that Ms. Romberger needs to get the information to Mr. Wolfe.

Ms. Arnold noted that the LP Community Cats will provide some high volume spay/neuter clinics using Keystone Mobile Veterinarian Services in Swatara Township at the park shed which is where the PAWS clinics are held. She noted that it is a large trailer that has two technicians and a veterinarian, Dr. Murphy, who can do 110 cats a day. She noted that he is more expensive as his overhead costs are higher. Ms. Arnold invited the Board members to come and tour the facility in Camp Hill. Mr. Seeds noted that Ms. Arnold should provide the address to Mr. Wolfe. Ms. Arnold noted that the primary contact will continue to be LP Community Cats. She noted that she would be happy to host seminars monthly in the Township.

Discussion with representatives from Triple Crown Corporation regarding Stray Winds Farm, Phase 1

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board approved the preliminary subdivision plan for Stray Winds Farm (SWF) and that subdivision plan for various reasons has been dormant for three years. He noted that Triple Crown Corporation (TCC) has decided to move forward with the plan and they want to discuss how they plan to do that. He noted that he does not think it will involve much on the part of staff except for the amendment of a phasing plan to accommodate a revised phasing schedule.

Mr. Mark DiSanto distributed various copies of a revised phasing plan. He explained that he contacted Mr. Wolfe to inform him that he has decided to proceed with the development of SWF. He explained that he met with Mr. Wolfe, Mr. Stine, Mr. Fleming, and Ms. Moran to discuss a new concept. He noted that one area in the Final Phase I plan that was approved and recorded was age-restricted housing. He noted that he had four phases, A through D, starting with a few townhouses, group of single-family units, smaller single-family units and age-restricted units. Mr. Hawk questioned if that was all Phase 1. Mr. Mark DiSanto answered yes,

calling them Phase 1-A through 1-D. He noted that the plan received a variance to provide for a higher density with two law suits pending on the variance. He noted that the Snyder case has been decided in final form against the plan and the other case is pending with several years of litigation. He noted, without having the answer for the final form, he decided to hold off on the age-restricted phase. He noted if he loses the last case, he loses the additional 75 units that were approved by the variance and he would redesign that phase with 75 less units. Mr. Crissman questioned if it would continue to be age-restricted. Mr. Mark DiSanto noted that the plan would not be bound by that restriction. He noted that the litigation could last for three months or three years, but he wants to continue with the townhouses, single-family and other homes. He noted that the plan in all other forms is staying the same as when it was approved, noting that he has the right under the Yield Plan to build the 374 homes that it showed, and staff agrees that he has that right. He noted that he could build 50 of the units in round numbers and he would be stopped at 374. He noted that it was decided to leave the age-restricted alone until he has the answer to the litigation.

Mr. Mark DiSanto noted that he would like to move the age restricted to Phase 9 and hold it off until we know what is going on with the variance and how he will proceed with it. He noted that the open space and setbacks that were negotiated with neighbors on all the other phases would stay the same, as well as the park and walking trail and bridge over the creek; all the internal improvements would stay the same as they are shown on the plan. He noted that the reconstruction of McIntosh and Crums Mill Road and the over-vertical on Crums Mill Road will stay the same. He explained that is all that is required at this time. He noted that the agreement with the offsite improvements was tied to the variance.

Mr. Mark DiSanto noted in his conversations with Township staff that it was agreed that it is the cleanest way to do this since Phase I is a final approval. He noted to modify the plan to show Phases A, B, C and take that part of Phase 1-D, dealing with the age-restricted and rename it Phase 9 and update the entire phasing schedule.

Mr. Hawk noted that the road improvements would be McIntosh and Crums Mill Roads. Mr. Mark DiSanto noted that he would make improvements to the down-vertical intersection and part of the road would be straightened and the over-vertical on Crums Mill Road would be taken out. He noted there is a big over-vertical on Crums Mill Road near the farm that will be lowered

to make the intersections work. He noted that all the internal construction will stay the same as discussed over the last six years.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the improvements to Colonial Road will not happen. Mr. Mark DiSanto answered yes, at this time. He noted if the variance is upheld, and he is able to proceed with the original plan, then it will happen.

Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. DiSanto stated that he met with staff and it was his perception that staff was in agreement; he asked Mr. Wolfe if that is true. Mr. DiSanto noted that Mr. Wolfe told him to bring this plan to the Board to show the Board the rephrasing plan to see if they agree with it. Mr. Wolfe answered that Mr. DiSanto is representing very well the discussions that were held given the fact that staff relied on Mr. Stine's opinion as to the ability to move forward and the need to rephrase, he would like to have Mr. Stine speak to that.

Mr. Stine noted that the solution that staff and TCC came to was as long as they held out the one piece of the plan, and realized that it may never be built as shown as it may have to be redesigned and rephrased, all the other phases are lined up and provide for a new phasing schedule. Mr. Crissman wanted to be assured that what staff is saying is the same as what TCC is saying.

Mr. Wolfe noted that it is his understanding that other than a phasing line difference, there will be no other changes to the plan and the final approval for Phase I in the preliminary plan will remain as approved with the phasing plan change, noting that it occurs with subdivision plans all the time.

Mr. John DiSanto noted since the meeting with staff he made contact with Mr. Eric Epstein, to review the proposal and answer questions. He noted that the senior people from SWAN are reviewing the change and he is attempting to engage everyone.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Steve Fleming had any comments. Mr. Fleming answered no as it is not an engineering issue.

Mr. Eric Epstein explained that he met with Mr. John DiSanto last week and he had a data exchange, sharing the information that he got from TCC on the data exchange and he stated that he does not know if too much was modified from the original agreement. He wanted to make sure that what SWAN negotiated was preserved. He suggested that the only thing that may be altered is some of the stream buffers that were larger than they needed to be. He noted that the

park and walkway will be in place. He noted that the intersection of Crums Mill and McIntosh Roads is very dangerous and it will be taken care of, and the over-vertical on Crums Mill Road north will be fixed. He noted that much of the negotiation will remain in tack without the 74-unit build-out; however, at some time Colonial Road and McIntosh Road intersection has to be addressed. He noted that TCC did not create the problem, but it is still there. He noted that SWAN continues to have a few questions that he is working through with John and Mark DiSanto. He noted that he can't offer a legal opinion, only protect the settlement agreement that he had with TCC and for a large part it has been preserved. He noted that the big thing is the 74 units and that the intersection at Colonial Road will not be repaired. Mr. Wolfe noted that the plan elements remain exactly as they were. Mr. Epstein noted that it was a substantial settlement agreement that included eight different neighborhoods and the big difference is Colonial Road and McIntosh Road. Mr. John DiSanto stated that is the only difference. He noted that the stream buffer has remained the same. Mr. John DiSanto noted if TCC does not prevail for the age-restricted variance, it will be much less dense, and those buffers will remain as shown but they will all get bigger in that area as he may only have 1/3 of the units. Mr. Epstein noted that TCC agreed for the original plan to make sure everyone had a buffer that had a contiguous property which included some tree plantings. He noted that there are only a couple of elements that are missing.

Mr. Hawk wanted to ensure that there are no surprises. Mr. Crissman noted that we all understand that Phase 9 is the one that is being held.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Robbins if he had any comments. Mr. Robbins answered no.

Mr. Mark DiSanto noted that the next step would be to formally submit this as a revised phasing plan to the Board for its approval, noting that he would replace the bonds, and have Mr. Stine review the administrative aspect of moving forward. Mr. Crissman questioned if everyone will work out the proper language. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be on the phasing schedule and the last phase would not be able to build it if they have a negative litigation.

Mr. Mark DiSanto noted that the lower corner of the plan shows that Phase 9 is the last phase.

Mr. Epstein questioned if anything had to be done with the highway studies or traffic studies. He questioned if they remain the same. He explained that he does not have knowledge of

Highway Occupancy Permits (HOP). Mr. DiSanto noted that it is the same preliminary plan which included the traffic study and there is no HOP required as there is no state roadwork. Mr. Fisher noted that it involves Township roads only. Mr. Mark DiSanto noted that the NPDES Permit has been renewed and all the permits are in good shape. He noted that he will revise the plan, and submit it for official action for the next business meeting.

Review of a sketch plan for the proposed
Benjamin Slotznick Hillside Road subdivision

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Slotznick is present to discuss a three lot subdivision along with Jeff Staub from Dauphin Engineering. He noted that it is proposed at the end of Hillside Road.

Mr. Jeff Staub explained that Mr. Slotznick wants to do a resubdivision of a parcel of ground off of Rutherford Road near the Pennswood Apartments that would be accessed by Hillside Road. Mr. Slotznick noted it is the area where his mother lived near Old Rutherford Road. Mr. Blain noted that it is the land behind Mr. Beinhaul's home. He noted when she died in 2010, he sold the homestead and there were lots fronting Clarendon Street.

Mr. Hawk questioned if it was a big area. Mr. Blain answered that the back of her house is wooded out to Dartmouth Street. Mr. Slotznick noted that the part that goes out to Dartmouth Street is owned by Mr. Beinhaul. He noted what is left was originally three lots that have access to Hillside Road from the Old Colonial Park Farm subdivision. He noted that he was told by United Water PA in order to provide service to the lots, they must all have frontage on a public street. He noted that he could not request a variance for a shared driveway due to the water company's requirements for service. He proposed a subdivision showing frontage at Hillside Road.

Mr. Slotznick explained that he came before the Zoning Hearing Board for a variance and it was granted. He noted that there is a significant slope that prevents building a cul-de-sac for access to the three lots.

Mr. Seeds questioned what the variance was for. Mr. Slotznick answered that it was for lot frontage, noting that you have tiny frontage, with a little bit of a shared driveway in the front. Mr. Staub noted that the only location for a lot frontage for the properties is 30 feet. He noted for the existing three lots, only one has frontage on Hillside Road with the other two being land

locked. He explained that he reconfigured the lot lines to keep three lots, but now all three lots have frontage on Hillside Road, made up of 13 feet.

Mr. Staub noted that the variance that was granted was a minimum lot width at the building setback line which is 90 feet. He noted that he has 13 feet. He noted that given the uniqueness of the property and the fact that there are three existing lots of record; the Zoning Hearing Board felt that there was a hardship. He explained that he recused himself from the hearing and was not in attendance.

Mr. Staub explained that he met with Mr. Stine and Ms. Moran and they suggested that the plan go before the Board at a workshop session to see if the Board would support a waiver request to allow a new subdivision plan to be recorded as the waiver request has to do with not providing the traditional cul-de-sac, and in its place a small turnaround. He noted that the three lots would have a shared driveway as opposed to a cul-de-sac. He noted that it would only be about 25 feet to 30 feet in width.

Mr. Seeds questioned if that would be the only waiver the plan would need. Mr. Staub answered that it should be the only one as there are no other improvements listed, such as curb or sidewalk as he is not proposing any public improvements. He explained that 14 feet of roadway would have to be finished at the end of Hillside Road.

Mr. Hawk noted that it would be a long driveway for Lot 168. Mr. Staub answered that it was about 120 feet long. Mr. Slotznick noted that the lots are not small, they meet Township regulations for the R-1 zone except for the driveway, but the surrounding lots are much smaller. Mr. Seeds noted that it is zoned R-1. Mr. Slotznick noted that some of the lots surrounding it are zoned R-2.

Mr. Crissman questioned, after people buy the lots and there are issues with the shared driveway, who deals with that. Mr. Slotznick answered that there would be a cross easement and they must deal with it among themselves. Mr. Crissman suggested that they will try to involve the Township in it. Mr. Slotznick noted that he tried to come up with the smallest amount of shared driveway, noting that there is very little that is shared among them. He noted for the cross easement, when you pulled into one of the driveways, you are going to place some of your tire over the other persons driveway. Mr. Crissman suggested that it would be a problem for the

Township that he would not want to deal with. He noted that it will create problems and the people will come to the Township to resolve it.

Mr. Hawk noted that he agrees with Mr. Crissman's comments, noting that he tried to make sense of the plan but he needs to go look at it. Mr. Staub noted if you do that you will understand why we are making the request that we are making as the distance from the cross street, which is Calvert to the end of Hillside Road, is two small lots on that street with small homes. He noted that there is no traffic there and the school buses do not go back in that area and the buses won't drive back there if the three lots are developed. Mr. Seeds questioned why. Mr. Staub answered that the school buses don't do cul-de-sacs. Mr. Slotznick suggested that they pick up the students at Dartmouth Street.

Mr. Seeds questioned what Mr. Crissman's concerns are. Mr. Crissman noted that anytime there is a problem in that location it would involve the Township as the property owners will be fighting among themselves as to who is responsible. Mr. Seeds questioned if he was talking about snow removal. Mr. Crissman answered anything. Mr. Slotznick noted that he is happy to call them individual driveways with cross easements so when one person drives into the site there is enough space to drive out but part of the wheel will go over the edge of the next property. Mr. Crissman noted if there is a dispute between owners they will be coming to the Township to act as mediators. He noted that he is not doing that and it is a problem. Mr. Crissman suggested that the Board should look at it on Road Tour. Mr. Blain noted that it is down the street on Hillside, we can all just go and look at it. He noted that Hillside Road ends with woods and trees. Mr. Slotznick noted that there is a two foot high mound of dirt.

Mr. Blain noted that the Township has other places in the Township that have shared driveways and we don't have a ton of issues from people complaining. Mr. Wolfe noted that we don't have a ton of issues for shared driveways, but we do have issues with having the ability to have a drive around on a dead end street and it does present maintenance issues for snow removal. He noted once it is in shared ownership, if they call us, we tell them that it is not a Township issue. He noted that they may try to involve us but we will not become involved in it.

Mr. Staub noted that the plan shows a snow storage area for the property and they will provide a turnaround for anyone who wanders into the end of Hillside Road. He noted that he will pave a bit of the snow storage area to allow a turnaround for backing up. He noted that the

length of this section of Hillside Road is not even 200 feet from the intersecting street of Calvert. Mr. Slotznick noted that there are two houses and one faces Calvert Street.

Mr. Fleming noted that the former recommendation was to install a cul-de-sac at the end of Hillside Road, subdivide the property, but after the applicant demonstrated that he couldn't facilitate a cul-de-sac, the recommendation was to come up with an alternative. He noted that he did not review or approve this alternative, but it addresses all of HRG's comments with why a cul-de-sac would be required to include snow storage, truck and trash truck turnarounds, eliminating shared access, all of which are problematic. He noted that you will have some stormwater and grading concerns. He suggested that more information needs to be presented before a final decision is made. Mr. Crissman noted that there is not enough space for half of a cul-de-sac. Mr. Slotznick noted that the cul-de-sac would look like this. Mr. Staub noted to his understanding, it was part of the hardship that was made in the granting of the variance from the Zoning Hearing Board that as a practical matter it would be impossible to build a cul-de-sac using the Township's specifications and still build three lots. He noted that it would be almost impossible to site a house on the upper lot as there would not be enough buildable area.

Mr. Slotznick explained that there is a hill and the cul-de-sac would have a slope and to build it correctly he would have a huge embankment and he would end up building a retaining wall to make it.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Staub if he has addressed the stormwater issues as it would be a concern. Mr. Staub answered that he has not addressed those issues yet.

Mr. Seeds noted that he would like to visit the site before making a decision. Mr. Hawk noted if you go to the end of Hillside Road you will not see anything but trees. Mr. Blain noted that it is a sub street from Calvert as it is not very long and there are only two houses at that location. He noted that there is a dirt pile and a fence at the end of the road. He noted that it is all woods. Mr. Hawk noted that he would want to include it on the road tour.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Slotznick was in a hurry to get this plan approved. Mr. Slotznick answered no, noting that he wants to move along since he got the variance, and he is fine with the Board looking at the property.

Mr. Staub explained if Mr. Slotznick had to build a cul-de-sac for this type of development, it wouldn't be feasible.

Mr. Blain questioned if you could subdivide the property into two lots instead of three lots. Mr. Slotznick answered that he could look at it but it would depend on how many other things the Township requires. He noted with three lots, he would have to finish Hillside Road, install a fire hydrant, noting that the cost of half an acre is usually \$33,000.

Mr. Seeds questioned if these lots would have public water and sewer. Mr. Staub answered yes.

Mr. Hawk noted that the Board needs to take a look at the property on its next road tour.

Pavement Management program demonstration

Mr. Robbins explained that he would do a brief presentation on the pavement management program. He thanked the Board for providing him the funding to purchase the program.

Mr. Robbins noted that eRoadInfo Pavement is a pavement management system that is based out of Maryland. He explained that they built the system that automates pavement management tasks from road inventory and data collection to data analysis, decision support, budgeting, and reporting. He noted that they bring this information to the desktop for the end user so staff does not have to go out in the field measuring lengths and widths of streets to come up with the information. eRoadInfo Pavement brings the information from the road to the engineer and manager's desks, helping them make better pavement repair decisions more effectively

Mr. Robbins explained that a few things to keep in mind during the presentation is that a street segment is a length of roadway between two streets or two intersections and this program only looks at street segments. He noted that Houcks Road could have seven different segments. He noted that the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) is a numeral rating system for street segment ranging from zero to 100 that was developed by the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers as a national standard. He explained that roads are rated by looking at this formal rating system and that is what this does. He noted that the Assets Inventory Vehicle is nothing more than the vehicle that eRoadInfo drove through the Township, taking five weeks to cover all the roads, noting that they have six high resolution cameras that are located around the vehicle as well as other equipment used to take pictures of the roadway which is put on a spreadsheet.

Mr. Robbins noted that the Pavement Management Program is comprised of eight steps. He noted that he would not be able to do this program if staff did not have the roadway inventory GIS centerline data. He noted that the pavement data collection was completed, collecting road surface images; after which the system does a pavement distress evaluation for each road segment; looking at the repair decision tree that configures the repair methods, He noted that it is able to create “what if” scenarios depending on the amount of funding, and other things to determine the repair method recommendation that provides what you may want to do for a given paving condition index. He noted that it also has the ability to provide reports and generate maps and text reports; and generate work plans to share with contractors who are doing paving within the Township.

Mr. Robbins noted that the Asset Inventory Vehicle (AIV) has six high resolution cameras and other specialized equipment around the perimeter of the vehicle providing a detailed photograph of the roadway and a 360 degree image with each photo taken. He noted that images were taken every 35 feet for each road segment of the entire 200 mile road network. He noted that other assets were captured such as street signs and pavement markings. He noted that each end user has the ability to zoom in on each image to show great detail and the images are very useful in determining land based features all while sitting at a desktop PC.

Mr. Robbins displayed pictures that were taken on Jonestown Road from the east end of the Township starting at Bridge 10, the Beaver Creek Bridge at the Township line. He noted that the vehicle was headed east into the Township and the pictures actually start at West Hanover Township. He noted that the bridge is in the process of being replaced. He noted that the first picture shown is a standard picture from the front of the AIV, noting that it shows cracking and bad joints. He explained that it was originally a concrete roadway that was paved over with asphalt. He noted that the next frame is exactly 25 feet from the last picture and he can actually flip the camera to view the back of the traffic signage to see when it was installed. He noted that the next picture shows the bridge deck. He noted that the pictures show the wear on the bridge decking and the next picture shows that the edge of the road is wearing away from water. He noted that the next picture shows rutting in the tire wear area and cracks running down the joint. He noted that the joints vary from 40 to 60 feet for the entire length of the roadway. He noted

that the asphalt is starting to unravel in the following pictures and it also shows a bag of garbage along the roadway. He explained that the pictures were taken in June of this year.

Mr. Robbins noted that the collection of images is used for data analysis and each road segment is rated and a PCI is calculated. He noted that the data analysis is used in decision support and that is used for budgeting and reporting. He noted that the reports can be created to show data in various forms, either graphs or charts.

Mr. Robbins noted that eRoadInfo allows the end user to create reports and work plans that can be used throughout the year and during the budget process. He explained that he copied crack seal candidate reports and drainage problem reports. He noted once they compile the data for each length of the street, it is put in a data table and once the end user sits down and plugs in the data for what street you want to do and what process you want to do it with, you add a dollar value and it will put out costs that will be very handy.

Mr. Hawk questioned if it will rate the seriousness of the roadways to determine what needs to be addressed first. Mr. Robbins noted that he wants to come back to talk to the Board to establish what it wants for a PCI, what index to select, such as 60, noting that every road 60 and above, staff will attempt to keep those roads in good repair which may entail crack sealing and a micro surface. He noted that it must be determined what needs to be done for anything 60 and lower. He noted that setting the critical PCI is very important.

Mr. Hawk noted that it would help if the legislature would fund the Transportation Bill.

Mr. Robbins noted that a roadway that is rated 1-10 is a failed road, 10-25 is serious; 25-40 is very poor; 40-55 is poor; 55-70 is fair; 70-85 is satisfactory and 85-100 is excellent. He noted that the Township has no roads rated as failed.

Mr. Robbins explained that the PCI distribution for the Township streets is as follows: 3% are serious; 3% are very poor; 18% are poor; 34% are fair; 31 % satisfactory; and 14% are excellent. He noted that you would want to be in the green as much as possible. Mr. Blain noted that blue is also good. Mr. Robbins noted to keep the street in the good ranges; money needs to be spent to keep them from deteriorating. Mr. Wolfe noted that 80% of the streets are rated at fair, satisfactory or excellent and 20% are poor or very poor and none are rated as serious.

Mr. Blain noted as you go through the budget process to determine what you will do streetwise, you are not just going to focus on the streets that are in the serious and very poor

condition; but you must also focus on the fair and satisfactory condition with the intent to get the most longevity out of the road as you can. He noted if you can get five years of additional longevity out of a road the cost savings is substantial and 66% of the streets that are fair and satisfactory could be planned for micro surfacing or crack sealing or additional stormwater management to get water off the roads. He noted that staff had to reclaim the entire street in Huntfield and this would prevent that from occurring.

Mr. Robbins noted if you get to a certain point where the roadway needs a certain percentage of base repairs, which is very expensive, it makes more sense to grind it up and start all over.

Mr. Robbins displayed a pavement deterioration curve noting that you don't want to get very low on the curve as it is very expensive to repair it.

Mr. Blain noted that it will stretch the dollars to do more surface repair and maintenance than what has occurred in the past. He suggested that staff will get more miles done in a year since it can stretch the dollars.

Mr. Robbins noted if you plug into the program \$500,000, it may tell you to spend \$300,000 to \$400,000 in crack sealing to preserve pavement life. He noted that it is very hard to put your arms around how big the Township is. Mr. Fleming noted that it is a good forecasting tool. He noted that staff picks the parameter such as dollars or what you want your road to be or how to allocate the funds and it will project what it will do for the roads in the future. He noted if you don't spend enough money, it will show you how your PCI will start to decline.

Mr. Robbins noted that 2,400 road segments were collected into the database, and the highest PCI is 100 and the lowest is 11. He noted that the longest street segment is 5,860 feet and the shortest is 30 feet and the average PCI for the entire road network is 64.

Mr. Robbins noted that there are many repair methods built into the system and the Township uses many of them such as crack filling, overlays from one inch to an inch and a half, mill resurfacing, curb line milling for gutter control, full depth reclamation with an overlay, cold mix recycling, noting that it is very popular as it saves on greenhouse emissions. He noted that you mill the asphalt that goes into a tray that has emulsions added and it is set back on the road.

Mr. Robbins displayed a segment report for Abbey Lane. He noted that it shows the length of the road, width, overall area and PCI. He noted that he showed a report that was done

for the roads that fall between the PCI of 50 and 80. He noted if you crack seal those roadways or mill and surface, it would keep the PCI from dropping. He noted that there maybe 17 pages of reports and it would be very handy to provide that to a contractor to tell him to go out and crack seal the roads and he would enter that data into the system.

Mr. Fleming explained that the program comes with default repair method based on the PCI rating and as it ages and time goes on. He noted if a sewer project comes up and you change what you do to the road, you can manually change and add the information that a repair was done and it would come off the list to be rerated so it is an active log.

Mr. Robbins noted that the addition of the tool will allow staff to better perform the following tasks: spend budgeted dollars in the most efficient manner possible; assist the Board in setting a critical PCI that can be used to determine what roadways will need routine maintenance to keep the PCI from declining; prepare budgetary information for long term capital projects for roads that need more extensive repairs; use the PCI in assisting the Board and staff in educating the public on why a particular treatment was selected for a roadway; and better predict the necessary paving dollars needed.

Mr. Robbins noted that PennDOT has come up with 12 suppliers of a produce called warm mix as opposed to hot mix. He noted that they say that it is cheaper and more durable. He noted that there are some learning curves that need to be understood about the project in the actual spreading of it. He noted that PennDOT is recommending it as a longer wearing, better from the standpoint of fumes. Mr. Robbins noted that the warm mix asphalt is more environmentally friendly as you are not heating the asphalt up to the same temperature. He noted that he does not think that it lasts longer but it might be more environmentally friendly. Mr. Hawk suggested that it might be economical since you don't have to heat it as much. Mr. Robbins stated that he is not sure the economical costs are there, or at least he hasn't seen it yet.

Mr. Fleming noted that it is relatively new technology that just came out last year and plants are converting over to it. He noted that the asphalt production side uses less fuel to heat the asphalt and it has a placement benefit as the asphalt is produced at a lower temperature so it holds the temperature longer. He noted when boiling water cools, or warm water cools, they cool at different rates. He noted that you can keep the temperature lower and the asphalt pliable longer. He noted that it helps with transportation and placement issues but the longevity of the

material has not been determined yet, but it has grabbed PennDOT's attention. He explained that Pennsy Supply has converted one of its plants locally to a warm mix and it is probably the trend that asphalt will go, similar to the Superpave trend.

Mr. Hawk noted that some townships have tried but it hasn't been around long enough to determine how long it will last. Mr. Robbins noted that the environmental agencies for protecting greenhouse gases will push for this in the future. He suggested that more plants will convert over to it. He noted that it is expensive for a plant to make the change

Mr. Hawk explained that it is to be less expensive and he wanted to throw it out as a new technology. Mr. Fleming noted that it may take a while for the cost savings to catch up after they make up the cost of converting the plants.

Mr. Seeds noted that the pavement management program was in last year's budget and he questioned what the name of the program is. Mr. Robbins answered eRoadInfo. Mr. Seeds questioned if the program is completed. Mr. Robbins answered yes. Mr. Seeds questioned if they had an x-ray system that looked into the materials. Mr. Robbins suggested that he was referring to ground penetrating radar; he noted that the Township did not utilize that program. He noted that he has learned a lot from the Authority work that is being done, and he has learned how to adapt different technologies for the various pavement sections. He noted if you have a decent pavement section and a good base there is no reason why you can't grind the road up, add a polymer and put it back down. He noted if you don't have a good base you need to spend more money on the backend by doing some type of additive to it. Mr. Seeds noted that it was an option and he questioned if it would have been beneficial. He questioned if the company could go back and do that now. Mr. Robbins answered that he did not know. Mr. Fleming explained when eRoadInfo recaptures the information they could do it then. He stated that he is saying that it is not beneficial but at this point it would just be more information that you have that you may not utilize to its full potential. He noted that the data that has been collected and the program that the Township acquired will be a 100% improvement towards the paving management program. He noted that there are practical and contractual limitations that are experienced. He noted that the types of pavement methods that are actually used, noting if you put out a contract with seven different paving methods you will not get the economy of scale. He suggested that the Township may elect to do a pavement repair method that might not necessarily be recommended by the

pavement management program, but it is close second. He noted that it will help put a contract together that will get good pricing.

Mr. Seeds noted when staff is working on the 2014 budget; Mr. Robbins will make recommendations for what work the Township should do. Mr. Crissman questioned how you are going to use this particular piece of valuable data for budgetary purposes. He question if Mr. Robbins would generate the ideal situation and look at the realistic dollars to determine what staff can really do. Mr. Robbins noted that staff will have to play catch up on some of the streets, noting that Jonestown Road has a PCI rating of 37 to 45. Mr. Crissman noted that the Township will not be able to afford the idealistic numbers. Mr. Robbins noted that it will allow staff to look at the roads and budget for them. Mr. Crissman noted that he wants to be assured that staff will use the data that it has as it is excellent source to get the best bang for its buck.

Mr. Blain noted that it will provide the ability to plan out for five to seven years and mix between the ones that are fair and satisfactory and the ones that need reclamation. He noted that it seems that staff is always running to the biggest emergency to do that road, but now it can avoid doing that and increase the longevity of 66% of the roads that are in good shape to get five to seven more years out of them. He suggested that staff will be able to do more road miles with fewer dollars. He noted that the savings that it will see could be seven digit numbers long term.

Mr. Seeds noted that staff will have to incorporate storm drainage in with the road projects. Mr. Robbins noted that it is a function of paving roads. Mr. Seeds noted that it will be a different budget so it all needs to be coordinated to make the stormwater improvements before the roads are repaired. Mr. Hawk noted that it allows staff to formulate a rating system for the road.

Mr. Snyder noted that it helps to coordinate with other utilities to let them know where staff will be working in the future so they can get ahead with their systems.

Mr. Seeds noted that staff is following the sanitary sewer work and repaving, and that has to be coordinated along with the storm drains. Mr. Robbins noted that the Township is a big place and the road network is one of the single largest assets. He noted that it is over 200 lane miles now.

Mr. Blain noted that the road and infrastructure system in the Township is no different than cars and trucks that staff uses at the Public Works. He noted that staff needs to manage and

maintain them to get as much longevity out of them as possible. He noted that this program will set up the Township nicely for the next five to seven years to better establish what the budget should be for roads.

Review of scope of services proposed by the Township Engineer to
design a fill and grading plan for the Wolfersberger Tract

Mr. Wolfe explained that Mr. Fleming provided a scope of services and proposal for engineering design and permitting to use the Wolfersberger Tract as a fill site. He noted that this work would be done in coordination with the recently completed draft development plan for the Wolfersberger Tract that has been prepared by a Township Committee in conjunction with the Simone Collins consulting firm.

Mr. Steve Fleming, HRG, Inc., noted that he would advance some of the design effort for the Wolfersberger Tract to this point instead of waiting for the time that the Board is ready to construct the park. He noted that it would allow the Township to take advantage of the construction that is occurring throughout the Township to acquire and place fill material for that project.

Mr. Fleming explained, in order to do that, the Township must apply for a NPDES permit through DEP, and as part of the permitting requirements, there will have to be advance stormwater planning for the park as well. He noted that he has talked to Mr. Luetchford, Director of Parks and Recreation Department, as well as Simone Collins, who is the planning consultant for the project, and he anticipates moving forward with the coordination for the design to help advance the project.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Fleming's costs for services are estimated at \$43,900. He noted that this is not something new that was brought to the Board as the Board has discussed this in the past, but the need to move forward in a different direction has occurred because initially it was thought that staff could move forward under a previously approved NPDES permit; however, the permit has expired. He noted that the scope of work has expanded for this project significantly and Mr. Fleming has provided staff with a revised proposal for the Board to consider. He explained that the project provides for filling a parcel of land that staff can then develop in the future into recreational facilities and having a Township controlled fill site for

sanitary sewer projects and for Public Work's efforts. He noted if the Board finds the proposal acceptable, he would put this on the agenda for the August 20th meeting.

Mr. Seeds noted that he has some concerns as he is not happy with Simone Collins report for the phasing of the park and for what would be happening at Koons Park. He questioned how it would affect the fill areas at Wolfersberger Tract if and when changes are made in the design of the park. He noted that he knows that the area needs to be filled and someday there will be facilities of some nature in the new park but he is concerned that we would be placing the fill in the proper places. He explained that he is concerned that the \$43,900 would provide a complete study to let the Board know what needs to be elevated and where to put fill so when drivers come with the dirt and dump the fill they will be filling to a certain grade level that would be predetermined by HRG. He noted that the other item of concern is who will pay for the cost to place the fill, the Township or the Sewer Authority, since the fill will be coming from the Authority's projects. Mr. Wolfe answered that it is a Township project and it would initially pay the cost but if the site is being used by contractors for sewer work there would have to be some reimbursement for the availability of the site. He noted that it will have to be worked out. Mr. Seeds questioned if the contractor would pay for it or would it be part of the bid. Mr. Wolfe noted that there are different ways that it could be done, but it would have to be worked out between the Authority and the Township. He noted that it could be done as a charge to the contractor or as a charge to the Authority and they could pass it on.

Mr. Fleming noted that he anticipates preparing a grading plan that provides the maximum flexibility for placing a large amount of fill, creating flat areas for ball fields or it could be scaled back to do something else as proposed by the planner. He noted that those decisions have not been made yet but he is moving forward to design something that provides the most flexibility to adjust it as the project moves forward.

Mr. Seeds noted that it may be many years before the Township finds the funds to be able to develop the park and it could be a different Board with different ideas. He noted that Mr. Fleming would have to go with Simone Collins design or it would cost more money to move dirt later for a revised plan. He noted that certain areas would need fill no matter what the design is. Mr. Fleming answered yes, noting that he has done a preliminary coordination between what Simone Collins recommended for grading and what he originally recommended to maximize the

ability to take the material and the two plans are close. He stated that he revised the plan to meet a happy medium. He noted that he can adjust it in the future depending on what Mr. Luetchford directs him to do with the features that he wants to see in the park. He noted by incorporating all these entities, he can offer the most flexibility and protect the Township from a big change in the future. He noted if the Township decided to make the area a nature preserve and the entire fill had to be removed then you would run into something like Mr. Seeds was talking about.

Mr. Seeds suggested that it would take a lot of years as it would take a lot of fill with the priority being off of Wenrich Street to do the areas that we know we will need for parking. He noted that the parking area would be the first phase of the fill. Mr. Crissman noted that is why we need to have a plan. Mr. Fleming stated that he will show the staging of those fill areas and it would provide the ability to leverage the fill placement and grant applications to use as an in-kind contribution in acquiring for grants in the future. He noted that there are ten to 15 years of sewer projects scheduled. Mr. Stine noted that it is 15 years. Mr. Fleming explained that he wants to take advantage of the fill being generated and move it the shortest distance to use it for a Township project. He noted that this will not happen over night as it could take all of those 15 years or be accelerated by a demand that he could not forecast.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the Township will need permits from DEP. He questioned if there will be problems with heavy large vehicles, or will it be necessary to build a road to get the large trucks into the property to dump their fill. Mr. Fleming answered that the NPDES Permit will permit the construction of the construction entrance, all of the perimeter, E&S Controls, fencing placed around the wetland areas so that they are not disturbed, and sediment basins that will be converted into future stormwater basins. He noted that the Township will acquire the permits that it needs to do the fill through the scope of work. Mr. Seeds questioned if the PennDOT would make the Township take care of the over-verticals in the roadway on Wenrich Street. Mr. Fleming answered no as it is a Township street and a park planning effort.

Mr. Hawk noted that there is enough flexibility that the Township can start moving earth with a degree of satisfaction that it will come out satisfactory. He noted if you wait until you determine what every possible contingency is that could happen or what will interrupt your day, you wouldn't get up in the morning. He noted that you build enough flexibility into the project

so you can run with it. Mr. Fleming noted that there is a benefit to start moving dirt on the site as the longer it sits vacant and unused, the more overgrown it becomes and the wetlands could grow and impact areas that the Township wants to place park features in and impact the grading to make it less efficient to build the park. He noted that it is advantageous to get started on this project at this time.

Mr. Seeds noted that he is not opposed to this as he wants to move forward with it as the fill is available and it is a great opportunity.

Mr. Hawk instructed Mr. Wolfe to put this on the agenda for next Tuesday.

Mr. Robbins questioned how long it would take to obtain the permits. Mr. Fleming answered that it would take six months to move forward with the design and permitting efforts.

Presentation of the Winfield Street stormwater System study by the Township Engineer

Mr. Fleming explained that the Board requested HRG to do a study for Winfield Street in regards to its stormwater issues. He noted that it is an area between Devonshire Road and Route 22 that has historic flooding issues. He noted that he was asked to come up with solutions for this problem. He noted that he did a survey and prepared a stormwater module that found that the existing stormwater system does not facilitate a one-year design storm. He noted that it does not flood when it rains, but a significant storm causes some flooding concerns and sometimes the road has to be closed. He noted that the system was built over a period of years and due to that there are problems with different pipe sizes as they are not in a consecutive sizing order, providing a restriction in the middle of the system that might cause an inlet to surcharge. He noted as a result of the findings the roadways flood.

Mr. Fleming proposed a solution to design a stormsewer system that would handle a ten-year storm event which is the Township Ordinance requirement for a new subdivision. He noted that he would replace the undersized and existing pipe in the system and propose additional pipes to create capacity within the system to convey the water from the upstream flow to the downstream discharge. He noted that the intersection of Devonshire and Coventry Roads has a conflict with the sanitary sewer line that the proposed system would have to traverse. He noted that the sanitary sewer, stormsewer pipes, and manholes are all in a very congested area so

pipings needs to be separated and added. He noted that it is a very low lying flat area and once you get to Winfield Street, the area that is out to the discharged point has a very minimum cover situation so it will be problematic for adding larger pipes. He noted that the only way to create capacity is to add an additional pipe.

Mr. Fleming noted that the blue line shown on the plan is the storm sewer network; and the green lines are sanitary sewer network that goes down the middle of Wenrich Street to Cove Road where it all runs into a ditch off of Devonshire Road that runs out to Colonial Road. He explained that the stormsewer starts in the area of the Amesbury Development near the Friendship Center and the neighborhood between Devonshire Road and Jonestown Road contributes to the upper end of the system.

Mr. Fleming noted that Mr. Robbins identified some problematic inlet areas on Houcks Road, Bristol Road, Care Street and all the inlets along Winfield Street. He noted that a FEMA delineated flood plain is in this area as well so it all floods during a 100-year storm.

Mr. Fleming showed a proposed stormsewer network that is designed to facilitate a 10-year storm event noting that he would install newer and larger pipe from the intersection of Houcks and Devonshire Roads and an overland storm sewer system down through Winfield Street. He noted in addition he would propose a new stormsewer system that would run down Devonshire Road. He noted that the largest pipe that he can fit is a 36 inch pipe and some are twin types that would be problematic for construction. He noted that you will have a dual 40 inch discharge point near Devonshire Road which is the existing discharge point along Devonshire Road.

Mr. Fleming noted that he met with staff to discuss all the constraints that he was running into such as the larger pipe sizes and the twin pipe sizes, to come up with some alternatives noting that the cost of the system is growing expedientially. He explained that the only way to get a more efficient stormsewer network would be to install a squash pipe or a box culvert that would be able to facilitate this volume of water. He noted that the preliminary project estimates push this stormsewer networks costs well over \$1 million to \$2 million for this one area.

Mr. Fleming noted that he discussed with staff how to move forward. He explained if the project moves forward, it would be in the range of \$2 million which is more than what has been spent on any stormsewer project each year. He noted that it would be a fairly significant project.

Mr. Fleming explained that one alternative, noting that the existing stormsewer system is deteriorating on Winfield Street and would need to be replaced, would be to replace the system with new pipe, use plastic pipe to provide for a longer life span and provide some hydraulic components as it would be a smooth line pipe and replace pieces of the system that are causing surcharging and effecting the road network for the traveling public. He suggested that it would involve the intersection of Houcks and Devonshire Road; Houcks Road inlet system, and a replacement of the pipes around Cove Road with the largest that could be fit into the system to the discharge point.

Mr. Seeds questioned what the cost would be. Mr. Fleming answered that he has not estimated that cost yet but it would be significantly less; probably half of the \$2 million estimate. He explained, to replace the new pipe along Devonshire Road, it would have to be 18 to 19 feet deep, many houses are close to the road and it is a heavily traveled roadway adjacent to an elementary school. He noted that would limit the time of the year that the work could be done and it does not include working with the gas, water companies.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the pipe has to be that deep. Mr. Fleming answered that there is a hill in front of the school and he needs to gain slope down to the discharge point.

Mr. Hawk questioned what would the longevity be for the replacement system. Mr. Fleming answered that the design life will not be effected, but the design storm that it can handle would be, noting if you go with the plastic pipe or concrete box culvert, you will get similar life spans out of the system as they are rated at 50 to 100 year design range but they could last much longer than that.

Mr. Crissman questioned what the estimated time is to do the work on Devonshire Road. Mr. Fleming answered that the traffic would be detoured for four weeks to do the work. Mr. Crissman noted that you would need to do that work in July. Mr. Fleming explained that the utility relocations would start the preceding year so it would be a long term project. Mr. Fleming noted that the work with the utility companies would be done the preceding summer to get the project ready to do the stormsewer work the following summer and paving restoration the third year.

Mr. Robbins noted that this project is complicated since it is an upcoming mini-basin area noting that they replaced the sewer on Winfield Street but the rest of it is a mini-basin that will

be done sometime in the future. He suggested that it should be scheduled to be done at the same time the Authority does its work and suggested that it is a 2014 or 2015 project. Mr. Fleming suggested that it is a 2015 project. Mr. Robbins noted that he wants to get this studied to determine what the options are to be in line with the Authority project.

Mr. Fleming noted that regardless of whether the Township does the ultimate build out or replace in kind, once he finishes the design, he will start the utility coordination for either direction to get them out of the way before the project is started. He noted that there would be less impact if the additional piping is not installed in Winfield Street to the existing utility. Mr. Robbins noted that there is no pipe on Devonshire Road and it would be a new parallel pipe to get capacity as the pipe on Winfield Street has reached its useful life and will not handle a one year storm. He noted that putting a parallel pipe along Winfield Street is not an option but putting a box culvert is; however, it comes at a significant cost. He noted if there is a significant rain the water comes out of the inlets.

Mr. Crissman noted that there is also the issue of cutting across private property for a new pipe line. He noted that staff has done that before but it looks like only one property will be impacted. He noted that part of it might impact the Turkey Hill Land Development Plan and also for Comcast.

Mr. Seeds noted that the \$1 million plan would not take care of the same volume that the \$2 million plan would. Mr. Fleming noted that it would be a similar size pipe, larger where we can get it, improving the hydraulics of the system, noting that it would pass more water but it would not be that noticeable except for the smaller storm events. He noted that it goes all the way up into Devon Manor to the top of the hill around the Friendship Center, to the Shopping Center, and down this side of Route 22, possibly taking some of the Route 22 drainage and in the area of the Library as well. He noted that it is a fairly significant area.

Mr. Seeds questioned when the water leaves the Devonshire Road point, where does it go. Mr. Fleming answered that it goes across the undeveloped property behind the Devon Manor Pool and under Colonial Road. Mr. Robbins noted in 2011, the outfall pipe was lost and staff reset a new 40 inch pipe and a new end wall, noting that it would be a temporary fix. Mr. Fleming noted if you don't replace the last piece of pipe with the proposed 48 inch pipe discharge, then you won't have to get a new permit for the outfall as the Township currently has

a DEP permit for that outfall which could be utilized if staff increases the discharge at that point. Mr. Robbins noted that a sinkhole develops at the outfall location all the time and staff is constantly repairing it. He noted that we have to do something at that location.

Mr. Fleming noted that he is ready to move forward with the final design and knows what will work for the ten year storm and what needs to be done to replace the pipe in kind to address some of the upstream surcharge conditions to make all of that design easy as well. He noted that he is looking for direction noting that the cost estimate for the ten-year design is feasible from an engineering standpoint but from a cost stand point and utility relocation standpoint it pushed that target out of reach.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the \$1 million plan is the ten year plan. Mr. Fleming answered that the ten year plan is the \$2 million project. Mr. Seeds questioned if this would impact Earl Drive. Mr. Fleming answered no.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Fleming needs to provide a formal proposal for engineering. Mr. Fleming noted that it was authorize in the proposal but he is waiting for authorization to move forward with the two preliminary tasks to provide feedback and guidance. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board could authorize Mr. Fleming to move forward with this. Mr. Hawk noted that we don't know the cost. Mr. Fleming explained that he knows that the approximate cost of the ten-year design storm is \$2 million, with the other plan being half the cost. Mr. Wolfe noted that we are looking to approve the engineering design of the replacement in kind which is the lower priced option that Mr. Fleming recommends. Mr. Fleming noted that he would prepare the design plans and come back to present the cost estimate for that.

Mr. Hawk directed Mr. Fleming to do this. He noted that the cost for engineering is \$23,000.

Presentation of the Earl Drive culvert study by the Township Engineer

Mr. Fleming noted that the Earl Drive culvert is a similar request with backyard flooding that exists between Earl Drive, Topview Court and Harmon Drive. He noted that the Board recognized, from the residents that live in this area, that there is a flooding concern that impacts the properties in this area and it is impacted by a FEMA delineated 100-year floodplain. He

noted that the request was to study the area and determine what could be done to address the floodplain and improve the drainage in the Earl Drive area.

Mr. Fleming noted that encroachment on the floodplain from man-made features and placement of fill has negatively impacted the 100-year flood elevation. He noted that the Earl Drive culvert is capable of conveying the 100-year storm; however substantial headwater depths have developed at the culvert entrance creating a backwater effect in the channel for approximately 500 feet upstream of the culvert. He noted that the stormsewer crosses Curvin Drive and meets in the backyard of the property near Mr. Heaps and Mr. Hopple and goes down to the Earl Drive culvert. He noted when he analyzed the area; he determined that there was no benefit to make changes upstream that far. He noted that some could be done but it wouldn't impact the water service at this elevation.

Mr. Hawk noted that the water erodes the land. Mr. Fleming answered that it can. Mr. Hawk questioned if it was widened would it eliminate the stream from widening it further. Mr. Fleming answered that it will and that is the thought process that he is using with the proposed solution. He noted for the sheer volume of water that comes down the channel, it would have to be very wide.

Mr. Seeds questioned when they did the sanitary sewer work they put in a lot of big riprap stone. Mr. Fleming noted that it was constructed liked a rock wall. He noted that it is a couple hundred of feet up from Earl Drive. Mr. Seeds questioned if he would go beyond that area. Mr. Fleming answered that he would start at that point and go upstream. He noted that the stream channel geometry rate downstream from the riprap is similar so even if you took those rocks out and pull the slopes back it will get restricted immediately downstream and not have an impact on the flooding condition upstream.

Mr. Crissman explained widening the stream channel means taking property and the Township will get flack on that. He noted that people don't want the water to flood their land, but they don't want the Township to take their land either. He suggested that is the issue the Board will be faced with. Mr. Fleming noted that there is a benefit to direct the flooding from one property and placing it on another but that will be a decision to be made by the Board.

Mr. Fleming noted that there are two components to the solution; the first is in regards to some of the backyard areas and widening the existing channel to make it wider and consistent

with the upstream and downstream channel. He noted that the second component would be to install a new box culvert under Earl Drive. He noted that the existing culvert can pass the storm water by installing a new wider box culvert; it will pass the 100-year design storm at a lower elevation.

Mr. Hawk questioned what that would do to Earl Drive. Mr. Fleming noted that it would do nothing to the roadway as he would excavate it, put in a new box culvert, and build it back up. He noted that there is not a lot of room to work in that location as he could only make it a little wider noting that there are constraints. He noted that we could make it a lot wider but it would impact the floodplain elevation upstream. Mr. Seeds noted that if the plan would only provide one foot of relief from flooding. Mr. Fleming noted that is true for both options. He explained that he ran cross sections in the channel to show the Board. He explained that he added the property owner's names and location of their homes to the drawings. He noted that Marlene Schreffer's house is impacted by the 100-year flood elevation, with an existing narrow channel. He noted that the proposed grading would widen the channel and provide it with a flat bottom and a wider cross section and tie into the existing slope on the other side of the stream. He noted that it would lower the flood elevation by one foot.

Mr. Fleming noted that the next property is the Gerald Hopple property. He noted that it has a similar condition and he could widen out the narrow channel but the existing floodplain does impact the basement flooding and it would only lower it by one foot. Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Hopple stated that he had four feet of water in his basement. Mr. Hawk noted that he had about \$25,000 in damage, and it may not be easy to sell the house. Mr. Crissman noted that he chose to live there. Mr. Blain explained that Mr. Hopple stated that he has lived in that home for years and has only started to have these problems over the past six or seven years. Mr. Fleming noted in the past three years the area experienced storms that been excess of the 100-year storm.

Mr. Fleming noted for the Ronald Powell property, the building may have to be removed from the property and he may receive insurance to do it. He noted that the stream channel is very narrow behind his house and he could widen it out but it would only lower the flood plan 1.5 feet in his basement, close to the basement level.

Mr. Fleming noted for the Tyler Heap property, widening the channel would lower the water level one foot, the point where the water is just getting into the basement. He noted that the

stream channel is very narrow behind his home, noting that he has constructed some type of berm to protect his home from smaller storm events. He noted that he would propose to move the stream channel over and widen it. He noted for all the property owners, if the stream channel was installed for a smaller design storm like 2, 10, 25 year storms, would see a much greater benefit as the stream channel would not overtop as quickly because the channel has more capacity to convey the water. He noted since FEMA evaluates the 100-year storm, that is what he is using for the gauging method for the project but the benefit does not seem to be as significant there.

Mr. Fleming noted if you look at the aerial map, the green line would be the new channel location, the red line is the limit of disturbance, noting that it shows what properties would be disturbed to move the channel. He noted that the following slide had the property owner names on it. He noted that Irene Wrabble's house did not have a cross section shown as it is very high but her yard would be impacted due to regarding about 25% up into her yard. He noted that Ronald Powell will have grading almost up to his house. Mr. Seeds suggested that Mr. Heaps may have moved.

Mr. Robbins explained that the culvert pipe has holes in it but it is an arch pipe and he is unable to predict the life of the pipe.

Mr. Seeds questioned if staff could only work on the area 350 feet long by putting in riprap and widening. He noted that staff would have to meet with the people to tell them what they would get. Mr. Robbins suggested that staff will get opposition from some of the people like Mrs. Wrabble who will not cooperate.

Mr. Fleming noted that he looked at this with staff the same way he looked at Winfield Street Study for the cost benefit and project impact and he recommends that you do the channel improvements, but not replace the Earl Drive culvert as it is a metal culvert and even though the bottom portion has some signs of deterioration, it is a large culvert and there are remedial measures that staff could take to extend its life. Mr. Seeds questioned what would that be. Mr. Fleming answered that staff could put a coating on the bottom of the culvert, like a bridge treatment, and depending on whether they use grout or asphalt it could extend its life significantly at a low cost compared to replacing it as it would probably cost to \$300,000. He noted that doing the upstream channel work provides the biggest impact to the property owners

for the small design storms, but it does not do much for a 100-year storm event. He noted that it will help with the 10 and 25 year storm by trying to keep the water in the channel as long as possible so the neighbors don't experience the same frequency of flooding.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the design could be done in two phases. He noted that he could design a new culvert if you would like and just provide the size restraints. Mr. Wolfe noted that we should not design it now if we are not going to build it.

Mr. Fleming noted that we will try to design the geometry for the channel so you would not have to have a rock liner that would not be as nice to maintain; rather, some sort of matting that grass would grow through so that the property owners can mow it. He noted that it would be less expensive from a construction standpoint as you would be creating a new channel; however, you would have property owner impacts that would need easements from the property owners to destroy their property. Mr. Fleming suggested that the channel work would be about \$200,000 to \$300,000 but he does not know the costs for the lining or property owner impacts.

Mr. Seeds noted that we would have to meet with the property owners. Mr. Fleming stated that he would wait until he put a hard number to the project as he doesn't know if we will involve relocating sheds or swing sets. Mr. Seeds questioned whose properties would be involved. Mr. Fleming answered: Wrables, Powell, Topple, Heap as well as all those we discussed, would have impacts.

Mr. Seeds suggested that those people would be anxious to have improvements. Mr. Fleming noted that depending on what the perceived benefit is; however, it will impact their backyards. He explained that, now they may have a flat backyard and may not be in favor of changing the slope or having more channel impact. Mr. Seeds noted that some of the people have been flooded significantly. Mr. Fleming noted that since we know that the downstream culvert has as much to do contribution wise as the channel itself, we need to tell them up front that even if we replace the culvert we would only be able to lower the water level one foot.

Mr. Seeds questioned how much it would lower the water to the riprap and widen the channel. Mr. Fleming answered that it might lower it a couple of inches to half a foot because the headwater condition at the downstream culvert is contributing to that flood elevation as much as the channel is. He noted that it would only help with the nuisance storms, the 10 to 25 year

storms, but during a huge storm the likelihood of those properties being flooded is still there, and they will still have to buy flood insurance.

Mr. Fleming noted if you look at the FEMA floodplain on the other side of Earl Drive where it is very wide it opens into a wooded area but the channel is flat with shallow banks. He noted that the floodplain stayed with the stream as it is not as restricted, but the channel is almost three times as wide once you get to the other side of that culvert. He noted that is the largest limited factor keeping the storm in a channel, noting that you don't have the room to make the channel wide enough upstream. Mr. Seeds noted that there is a sanitary sewer line there, and staff would have to deal with that if it did the widening. Mr. Fleming noted that he would try to minimize the impact to that since it was recently replaced.

Mr. Hawk questioned, minus the culvert, what would be the cost for the design. Mr. Fleming noted that the widening would cost \$200,000 to \$300,000 and it would be part of one of the annual stormwater contacts. Mr. Wolfe noted that the next thing would be if the Board is inclined to do the culvert maintenance and upstream channelization, it would need an engineering proposal. Mr. Hawk noted that is what he was asking.

Mr. Seeds noted that he would sooner have Township staff meet with the residents that are affected. He explained that he was sure that Mr. Hopple would have been at the meeting if he could have been. He stated that we should discuss these things with the residents to let them know to replace the pipe would cost a lot of money that we don't have and it is only going to lower the water levels by one foot. He noted if they are being flooded at two or three feet, what difference will it make. He noted that they may not want to do anything. Mr. Fleming noted that we need to do a study to determine how much of their properties will be impacted. Mr. Seeds suggested that they may not want us to do anything. Mr. Hawk noted that he would not want his basement to get flooded every year. Mr. Seeds noted if Mr. Hopple finds out that it would only lower the flood level one foot and he would lose his lawn it might not make that much difference to him. Mr. Crissman noted that he might not even get a foot of relief. Mr. Seeds suggested that we should get the people together to explain this to them. Mr. Fleming noted if the water is only coming into the basement two to three inches instead of two feet or a foot it will still cause a significant amount of damage if they finish their basement. He noted if the property is in the floodplain, it will be impacted whether it is an inch or a foot.

Mr. Wolfe noted that staff can meet with the residents and provide the options to them and report back to the Board if that is the Board's desire. Mr. Crissman noted that no decisions have been made on this issue.

Discussion regarding the Township's ability to form a municipal authority for stormwater facilities

Mr. Wolfe noted that this issue is one that is not of high urgency and it could wait until the next meeting. Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Stine had more to report on this item. Mr. Stine answered yes. Mr. Seeds suggested that this is really important as we need to move ahead due to the stormwater issues. Mr. Stine noted that we can't do anything until September anyway. Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Stine could share the information with the Board.

Ranking of Dauphin County Local Share grant applications that have been authorized by resolution of the Board of Supervisors

Mr. Wolfe noted that he needs an answer on this grant item this evening. Mr. Wolfe explained that the Board must rank eight applications as he just received a request from the Heroes Grove Committee for a grant application. Mr. Crissman noted that the Board can't approve the request for a grant application until next Tuesday night. Mr. Wolfe explained that the Board can't authorize the submission tonight, but it could rank it if it wants to with the others that it has before it. Mr. Seeds noted that we already approved Heroes Grove for \$230,000. Mr. Wolfe explained that this is a different grant application for the same amount.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the eight applications include in the order received: Paxtonia Athletic Association for funds to install lights at the ball field, Lower Paxton Township Friendship Center application for funding for HVAC in the natatorium; Lower Paxton Township Youth Center requesting approximately \$102,000 to pave their parking lot that serves a ball field and the Penn Colonial Swim Club; Holy Spirit Health Systems for \$107,000 to fund medical equipment for the Center for Women's Health East; Contact Helpline requesting \$12,000 for a generator to keep their phones in operation when power goes out; Devon Manor Pool and Swim Club for \$65,000 for pool infrastructure improvements; Partnership Hope for \$36,000 to fund technology and community base care services; and this evening the Board received an application from Heroes Grove for \$230,000 for the construction of the Heroes Grove Memorial

and Amphitheater. He noted that the Board has not yet acted on the last one but it could do so in time for the submission of the application at the meeting next Tuesday night.

He noted that the Board is required under the guidelines of the Dauphin County Local Share Grant Program to provide a priority listing to Dauphin County of the applications that it has received.

Mr. Seeds noted that he had them ranked before the meeting but now the 8th one was added to the list.

The four Board members read their rankings to Mr. Wolfe and the following chart shows the result.

	Hawk	Seeds	Crissman	Blain	Total
Paxtonia AA	7	3	4	3	17
FC	1	1	1	1	4
LP Youth Center	2	4	3	2	11
Holy Spirit Health	5	8	8	5	26
Contact Helpline	3	7	6	4	20
Devon Manor Pool	6	2	2	6	16
Partnership for Hope	8	6	5	8	27
Heroes Grove	4	5	7	7	23

Friendship Center	4
LP Youth Center	11
Devon Manor Pool	16
Paxtonia AA	17
Contact Helpline	20
Heroes Grove	23
Holy Spirit Health	26
Partnership for Hope	27

Mr. Wolfe noted that the ranking is as follows: Friendship Center, Lower Paxton Youth Center, Devon Manor Pool, Paxtonia Athletic Association, Contact Helpline, Heroes Grove; Holy Spirit Health and Partnership for Hope. He noted that he would provide correspondence to Dauphin County indicating such a ranking.

Review of the Key Indicator Report for the 3rd quarter of 2013

Mr. Wolfe explained that Mr. Blain suggested that this be presented at the next televised public meeting.

“Otta Know” Presentation: The proposed Dauphin County
Municipal Waste Management Ordinance of 2013

Mr. Wolfe noted that this is for the Board’s information to read on its own time.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Stine if the Board had any choice for what Dauphin County is doing with its Municipal Solid Waste. He noted that this had to do with selling the incinerator. Mr. Stine noted that the ordinance deals with a couple of things, disposal of municipal waste and of the construction and demolition of waste. Mr. Seeds questioned if the Township can take construction waste wherever it wants to. Mr. Stine answered that Dauphin County has designated facilities for commercial waste. He noted that it can’t be taken to the incinerator.

Mr. Seeds noted that the Township does not have a choice for what they do. Mr. Stine noted that it is the City’s plant. Mr. Seeds noted that this concerns Lancaster buying the incinerator. Mr. Stine noted that is part of it.

Mr. Crissman questioned if this has to go on the agenda for a business meeting. Mr. Wolfe answered no.

Announcement

Mr. Hawk noted that he has been questioned on numerous occasions about the shooting that happened in Ross Township in Monroe County. He noted that two residents were killed and the zoning officer was killed. He explained that the zoning officer was a supervisor in the neighboring township. He reported that a person came into the meeting with the gun, and a lady stepped in front of the gunman however, the zoning officer pushed her aside and stepped in front the gunman and was killed. He noted that PSATS was at the funeral and will acknowledge the supervisor’s heroic efforts at the conference coming up in April. He noted that it was a tragic situation.

Mr. Hawk explained that the legislature is considering for Townships that are too small and have to rely on State Police to make some concession that the police would be more readily available for an on-call situation. He noted that we are fortunate that we have police officers on staff.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Blain seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman
Township Secretary